TABLE OF CONTENTS

			<u>Page</u>
	PRELI	MINARY STATEMENT	1
	INTRO	DDUCTION	1
	PROCI	EDURAL BACKGROUND	2
	STATE	EMENT OF FACTS	3
	ARGU	MENT	4
I.	THE R	ELATED ACTIONS SHOULD BE CONSOLIDATED	4
II.		ROPOSED LEAD PLAINTIFFS LD BE APPOINTED LEAD PLAINTIFFS	4
	Sat	tisfied The Procedural Requirements arsuant To The PSLRA	4
		he Proposed Lead Plaintiffs onstitute The "Most Adequate Plaintiff"	5
	1.	The Proposed Lead Plaintiffs Have Made A Motion For Appointment As Lead Plaintiffs	6
	2.	The Proposed Lead Plaintiffs Have The Largest Financial Interest	7
	3.	The Proposed Lead Plaintiffs Otherwise Satisfy Rule 23	7
		a. The Proposed Lead Plaintiffs Fulfill The Typicality Requirement	8
		b. The Proposed Lead Plaintiffs Fulfill The Adequacy Requirement	9

III.	THE COURT SHOULD APPROVE THE					
	PROPOSED LEAD PLAINTIFFS' CHOICE OF COUNSEL	0				
CON		1				
COP	CLUSION 1	_				

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

<u>Cases</u>	Page(s)
De La Fuente v. Stokley-Van Camp, Inc., 713 F.2d 225 (7th Cir. 1983)	9
Eisenberg v. Gagnon, 766 F.2d 770 (3d Cir. 1985), cert denied, 474 U.S. 946 (1985)	8
Fischler v. Amsouth Bancorporation, 1997 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 2875 (M.D. Fla. Feb. 6, 1997)	8
Greebel v. FTP Software, Inc., 939 F. Supp. 57 (D. Mass. 1996)	5,6
<u>Halperin v. Nichols, Safina, Lemer & Co.</u> , No. 94 C 6960, 1996 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 16111 (N.D. Ill. October 28, 1996)	9
In re Drexel Burnham Lambert Group, Inc., 960 F.2d 285 (2d Cir. 1992)	8
In re Milestone Scientific Securities Litig., 183 F.R.D. 404 (D.N.J 1998)	7, 10
In re Nice Systems Securities Litig., 188 F.R.D. 206 (D.N.J 1999)	5
<u>Johnson v. Celotex Corp.</u> , 899 F.2d 1281 (2d Cir.), <u>cert. denied</u> , 498 U.S. 920 (1990)	4
Lax v. First Merchants Acceptance Corp., 1997 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 11866 (N.D. Ill. Aug. 6, 1997)	passim

Statutes, Rules & Regulations

Fed. R. Civ. P. 23 pas	ssim
Fed. R. Civ. P. 42	4
15 U.S.C. § 78u-4, et seq	ssim